IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	
Plaintiff,	
v.)	Case No. 05-cv-329-TCK-SAJ
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO "DEFENDANT / THIRD PARTY PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF -- REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCEDURE FOR ENTRY OF CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER"

COMES NOW Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma, ex rel. W.A. Drew Edmondson, in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment, C. Miles Tolbert, in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma under CERCLA ("the State"), and respectfully requests that this Court deny "Defendant / Third Party Plaintiffs' Motion for Miscellaneous Relief -- Request for Establishment of Procedure for Entry of Case Management Order" (Docket Entry 425) for the reasons set forth below.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Poultry Integrator Defendants¹ have requested that this Court delay setting a date for the scheduling conference until after June 30, 2006 — more than a month and a half from now. A delay in the scheduling conference, however, is wholly unwarranted — particularly in light of the fact that this case has already been pending for nearly 11 months, that all of the primary defendants have been served and have answered, and that with each passing day the injury to the State's natural resources from the Poultry Integrator Defendants' unlawful conduct continues. At its core,

Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Cobb-Vantress, Inc., Cal-Maine Foods, Inc., Cal-Maine Farms, Inc., George's, Inc., Peterson Farms, Inc., Simmons Foods, Inc. and Willow Brook Foods, Inc.

the Poultry Integrator Defendants' motion is yet another in a long string of efforts not only to delay the State's case, but also to metamorphose the State's case into the case they wish the State had brought rather than the case the State has in fact brought. The State is the master of its Complaint and claims, and should be allowed to proceed expeditiously with its case. To this end, the State urges that a scheduling conference be held at the Court's very earliest convenience.

II. BACKGROUND

On June 13, 2005, the State filed its Complaint against the Poultry Integrator Defendants, seeking to hold the Poultry Integrator Defendants accountable for their past and continuing improper management and disposal of poultry waste within Arkansas and Oklahoma — conduct that has caused pollution of the Oklahoma portion of the Illinois River Watershed ("IRW"). The State withheld service of the Complaint in order to continue its attempts to achieve a negotiated resolution with the Poultry Integrator Defendants. These negotiations proved unsuccessful, and on August 19, 2005, the State filed its First Amended Complaint, and shortly thereafter effected service on the Poultry Integrator Defendants.

On October 3, 2005, the Poultry Integrator Defendants filed answers and approximately a half-dozen motions to dismiss. These motions are now fully briefed and ripe for resolution.

On October 4, 2005, the Poultry Integrator Defendants filed third-party complaints against more than 100 entities that live, own land or conduct business in the Oklahoma portion of the IRW.³ The third-party complaints seek indemnification and contribution from the third-party

In their motion, the Poultry Integrator Defendants characterize the State's allegations as being "that the alleged natural resource damages stemmed, at least in part, from common and naturally occurring nutrients " Poultry Integrator Defendants' Motion, p. 5. This is a mischaracterization and is misleading, see State's FAC, and in any event is irrelevant to the issue at hand.

The Poultry Integrator Defendants assert that "the case initiated by the Plaintiffs involves complex factual and legal issues potentially encompassing natural forces and the operations of a multiple of persons, entities and industries spanning the entirety of the Illinois River Watershed." Poultry Integrator Defendants' Motion, p. 5 (emphasis added). This assertion is incorrect; the case initiated by the State involves the Poultry Integrator

defendants based on alleged activities in the Oklahoma portion of the IRW, such as owning a septic system, that are wholly unrelated to the improper actions of the Poultry Integrator Defendants that are at issue in this case.

On November 3, 2005, the State of Arkansas filed a petition with the United States

Supreme Court seeking to invoke that Court's original jurisdiction in order to sue the State of

Oklahoma. On the basis of the State of Arkansas's Supreme Court filing, on November 14, 2005,

the Poultry Integrator Defendants sought to stay the proceedings in this case. Also on this basis, on

December 23, 2005, the Poultry Integrator Defendants sought to toll the running of the time to

serve their third-party complaints on the third-party defendants. On January 9, 2006, the Court

granted this motion. On February 21, 2006, the United States Supreme Court denied the State of

Arkansas's petition.

On February 24, 2006, the Poultry Integrator Defendants sought an extension of time to serve the third-party complaints on the third-party defendants. On March 21, 2006, the Court granted this motion, giving the Poultry Integrator Defendants until May 20, 2006, to effect service.

On April 5, 2006, the State filed a motion requesting the Court to sever and stay and / or strike or dismiss the third-party complaints.

On April 13, 2006, pursuant to the Court's March 24, 2006 order, the parties filed a Joint Status Report. In the Joint Status Report, the Poultry Integrator Defendants requested "that once the Third-Party Defendants have answered the Court hold a scheduling conference and enter a Case Management Order addressing the needs of the parties and to provide for orderly administration of the case." In contrast, the State requested "a scheduling conference at the Court's earliest convenience."

III. ARGUMENT

The Poultry Integrator Defendants' request to delay the scheduling conference (and hence the issuance of a scheduling order) until after June 30, 2006, is, in the State's view, simply another attempt to delay the progress of this lawsuit and should not be granted. Indeed, Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b) makes clear that the scheduling order "shall issue <u>as soon as practicable."</u> (Emphasis added.)

Despite the plain language of the Rule, however, the Poultry Integrator Defendants maintain that the scheduling conference should be postponed until <u>all</u> of the third-party defendants have answered. *See* Poultry Integrator Defendants' Motion, p. 4. The Rule, however, does not support this position. Rather, it ties the timing of the issuance of a scheduling order to the appearance of "a defendant" or the service of the complaint on "a defendant." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b). Significantly, in this case, <u>all</u> of the first-party defendants have been served and have answered. The case-in-chief is thus ready to, and needs to, proceed. Given that the injury to the State is continuing, it needs to proceed expeditiously.

Further, that not all of the third-party defendants have yet answered is of no moment.

First, as explained in the State's April 5, 2006 motion requesting the Court to sever and stay and / or strike or dismiss the third-party complaints, the claims asserted by the Poultry Integrator

Defendants in their third-party complaints are of dubious merit. Depending on how this motion is resolved, it is possible that the third-party complaints may be stricken or dismissed. Thus, the need for answers may well be mooted. Second, the third-party claims are for indemnity and contribution. To the extent these third-party claims even are legally or factually viable -- and the State disputes that they are -- they are contingent in nature, and thus should be tried only at the conclusion of the State's lawsuit. See State's April 5, 2006 Motion to Sever and Stay and / or

Strike or Dismiss. Thus, the third-party defendants would be proceeding on an entirely different schedule than the State.

Likewise, the existence of a case management order is not a prerequisite to a scheduling conference. The State has already reached out to the Poultry Integrator Defendants on various case management related issues -- e.g., the State has provided a proposed confidentiality order to the Poultry Integrator Defendants; the State has also discussed bates numbering protocols with the Poultry Integrator Defendants. The State stands ready and willing to work cooperatively with the Poultry Integrator Defendants on addressing case management issues, as set forth in the Joint Status Report and as discussed at the Rule 26(f) conference.⁴ To the extent that agreement can be reached on issues, the parties may bring these to the Court for incorporation into a case management order.⁵ To the extent that there are disputes on the issues, the parties can bring these to the Court for resolution, and in the meanwhile, default to the tried and true Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The absence of a case management order, however, is not an impediment to the entry of a scheduling order, and should not be seen as such. Indeed, the requirement that there be a case management order in place prior to a scheduling conference only serves to delay the holding of a scheduling conference.

Simply put, the State's case has been delayed long enough. There has been the Poultry Integrator Defendants' motion to stay in connection with the State of Arkansas's ill-founded petition before the United States Supreme Court. There has also been the Poultry Integrator Defendants' motions to toll and then extend the service deadlines for their third-party complaints. And now there is this motion. Attempts to tie a scheduling conference for the State's case to the

The State is thus at a loss to understand why the Poultry Integrator Defendants see the need for a Court order directing the parties to meet and confer for the purpose of establishing a case management order.

Hopefully, many case management issues can be resolved prior to a scheduling conference. But the one should not be tied to the other.

third-party complaints or the establishment of a case management order is, however, entirely unwarranted.

IV. **CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the State respectfully requests that this Court deny "Defendant / Third Party Plaintiffs' Motion for Miscellaneous Relief -- Request for Establishment of Procedure for Entry of Case Management Order." The time is presently ripe for a scheduling conference and scheduling order, and the State urges that a scheduling conference be held at the Court's very earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson (OBA #2628) Attorney General Kelly H. Burch (OBA #17067) J. Trevor Hammons (OBA #20234) Assistant Attorneys General State of Oklahoma 2300 North Lincoln Boulevard Suite 112 Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

s/ M. David Riggs

M. David Riggs (OBA #7583) Joseph P. Lennart (OBA #5371) Richard T. Garren (OBA #3253) Douglas A. Wilson (OBA #13128) Sharon K. Weaver (OBA #19010) Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen, Orbison & Lewis 502 West Sixth Street Tulsa, OK 74119 (918) 587-3161

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

May 12, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on this 12th day of May, 2006, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants.

Jo Nan Allen

jonanallen@yahoo.com bacaviola@yahoo.com

• Frederick C Baker

fbaker@motleyrice.com mcarr@motleyrice.com;fhmorgan@motleyrice.com

• Tim Keith Baker

tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net

• Douglas L Boyd

dboyd31244@aol.com

• Vicki Bronson

vbronson@cwlaw.com lphillips@cwlaw.com

· Paula M Buchwald

pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com loelke@ryanwhaley.com

• Louis Werner Bullock

LBULLOCK@MKBLAW.NET

NHODGE@MKBLAW.NET;BDEJONG@MKBLAW.NET

• Lloyd E Cole, Jr

colelaw@alltel.net gloriaeubanks@alltel.net;amy colelaw@alltel.net

• Angela Diane Cotner

AngelaCotnerEsq@yahoo.com

• John Brian DesBarres

mrjbdb@msn.com JohnD@wcalaw.com

• W A Drew Edmondson

fc docket@oag.state.ok.us

drew edmondson@oag.state.ok.us;suzy thrash@oag.state.ok.us.

• Delmar R Ehrich

dehrich@faegre.com kcarney@faegre.com;;qsperrazza@faegre.com

• John R Elrod

jelrod@cwlaw.com vmorgan@cwlaw.com

• William Bernard Federman

wfederman@aol.com law@federmanlaw.com;ngb@federmanlaw.com

• Bruce Wayne Freeman

bfreeman@cwlaw.com lcla@cwlaw.com

• Ronnie Jack Freeman

jfreeman@grahamfreeman.com

• Richard T Garren

rgarren@riggsabney.com dellis@riggsabney.com

• Dorothy Sharon Gentry

sgentry@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

• Robert W George

robert.george@kutakrock.com donna.sinclair@kutakrock.com

• Tony Michael Graham

tgraham@grahamfreeman.com

• James Martin Graves

jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com

• Michael D Graves

mgraves@hallestill.com jspring@hallestill.com;smurphy@hallestill.com

• Thomas James Grever

tgrever@lathropgage.com

• Jennifer Stockton Griffin

jgriffin@lathropgage.com

· Carrie Griffith

griffithlawoffice@yahoo.com

• John Trevor Hammons

thammons@oag.state.ok.us

Trevor Hammons@oag.state.ok.us;Jean_Burnett@oag.state.ok.us

• Michael Todd Hembree

hembreelaw1@aol.com traesmom_mdl@yahoo.com

Theresa Noble Hill

thillcourts@rhodesokla.com mnave@rhodesokla.com

• Philip D Hixon

Phixon@jpm-law.com

Mark D Hopson

mhopson@sidley.com dwetmore@sidley.com;joraker@sidley.com

• Kelly S Hunter Burch

fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us kelly burch@oag.state.ok.us;jean burnett@oag.state.ok.us

• Stephen L Jantzen

sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com mantene@ryanwhaley.com;loelke@ryanwhaley.com

• Mackenzie Lea Hamilton Jessie

maci.tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net;macijessie@yahoo.com

• Bruce Jones

bjones@faegre.com jintermill@faegre.com;bnallick@faegre.com

• Jay Thomas Jorgensen

jjorgensen@sidley.com noman@sidley.com

• Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee

kklee@faegre.com mlokken@faegre.com

• Raymond Thomas Lay

rtl@kiralaw.com dianna@kiralaw.com;niccilay@cox.net

• Nicole Marie Longwell

Nlongwell@jpm-law.com ahubler@jpm-law.com

Dara D Mann

dmann@feegre.com kolmscheid@faegre.com

• Linda C Martin

lmartin@dsda.com mschooling@dsda.com

• Archer Scott McDaniel

Smcdaniel@jpm-law.com jwaller@jpm-law.com

• Robert Park Medearis, Jr

medearislawfirm@sbcglobal.net

• James Randall Miller

rmiller@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net;clagrone@mkblaw.net

• Robert Allen Nance

rnance@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

• John Stephen Neas

steve neas@yahoo.com

• George W Owens

gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

• David Phillip Page

dpage@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net

• K Clark Phipps

ECF@ahn-law.com cphipps@ahn-law.com

• Marcus N Ratcliff

mratcliff@lswsl.com sshanks@lswsl.com

• Robert Paul Redemann

rredemann@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

• Melvin David Riggs

driggs@riggsabney.com pmurta@riggsabney.com

• Randall Eugene Rose

rer@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

• Patrick Michael Ryan

pryan@ryanwhaley.com jmickle@ryanwhaley.com;kshocks@ryanwhaley.com

• Robert E Sanders

rsanders@youngwilliams.com

• David Charles Senger

dsenger@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

• Jennifer Faith Sherrill

jfs@federmanlaw.com law@federmanlaw.com;ngb@federmanlaw.com

• William Francis Smith

bsmith@grahamfreeman.com

• Colin Hampton Tucker

chtucker@rhodesokla.com scottom@rhodesokla.com

• John H Tucker

ituckercourts@rhodesokla.com

• R Pope Van Cleef, Jr

popevan@robertsonwilliams.com

kirby@robertsonwilliams.com;kmo@robertsonwilliams.com

• Kenneth Edward Wagner

kwagner@lswsl.com sshanks@lswsl.com

• David Alden Walls

wallsd@wwhwlaw.com lloyda@wwhwlaw.com

• Elizabeth C Ward

lward@motleyrice.com

• Sharon K Weaver

sweaver@riggsabney.com msmith@riggsabney.com

• Timothy K Webster

twebster@sidley.com jwedeking@sidley.com;ahorner@sidley.com

Gary V Weeks

gweeks@bassetlawfirm.com

• Adam Scott Weintraub

adlaw@msn.com

• Terry Wayen West

terry@thewestlawfirm.com

Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr

kwilliams@hallestill.com jspring@hallestill.com;smurphy@hallestill.com

• Edwin Stephen Williams

steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

• Douglas Allen Wilson

Doug_Wilson@riggsabney.com pmurta@riggsabney.com

• J Ron Wright

ron@wsfw-ok.com susan@wsfw-ok.com

• Lawrence W Zeringue

lzeringue@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

I further certify that on this 12th day of May, 2006, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing will be mailed via first class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on the following who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

Jim Bagby

RR 2, Box 1711 Westville, OK 74965

Gordon W. Clinton

23605 S GOODNIGHT LN WELLING, OK 74471

Susann Clinton

23605 S GOODNIGHT LN WELLING, OK 74471

Eugene Dill

P O BOX 46 COOKSON, OK 74424

Marjorie Garman

5116 Highway 10 Tahlequah, OK 74464

James C Geiger

RT 1 BOX 222 KANSAS, OK 74347

Thomas C Green

Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP 1501 K ST NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005

G Craig Heffington

20144 W SIXSHOOTER RD COOKSON, OK 74427

John E. and Virginia W. Adair Family Trust

RT 2 BOX 1160 STILWELL, OK 74960

Dorothy Gene Lamb

Route 1, Box 253 Gore, OK 74435

James Lamb

Route 1, Box 253 Gore, OK 74435

Doris Mares

P O BOX 46 COOKSON, OK 74424

Teresa Brown Marks

323 CENTER ST STE 200 LITTLE ROCK, AR 72201

Charles L Moulton

323 CENTER ST STE 200 LITTLE ROCK, AR 72201 Motley Rice LLC (Hartford) 20 CHURCH ST 17TH FLR HARTFORD, CT 06103

Donna S Parker 34996 S 502 RD PARK HILL, OK 74451

Richard E Parker 34996 S 502 RD PARK HILL, OK 74451

Monte W Strout 209 W Keetoowah Tahlequah, OK 74464

C Miles Tolbert Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 NORTH CLASSEN OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73118

Robin L. Wofford Rt 2, Box 370 Watts, OK 74964

s/ M. David Riggs